<u>REMARKS</u>

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4 and 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Araki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,696).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki in view of Ames et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,429).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0087530).

Claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 are amended, and, thus, claims 1-16 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

<u>INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 8, 12 AND 13</u>

Independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 are anticipatorily rejected over Araki.

Araki, cited by the Examiner, relates a method for restricting a client or user respectively to refer to data of a WWW server by using a WWW browser. Upon reviewing Araki, column 6, lines 15-28, which is relied upon in the Office Action, it operates as follows:

1)   Araki displays the data of user for inquiring as to whether the user will demand to receive a service for obtaining pages under reference restriction (column 6, lines 15-25).

2)   When the user clicks a confirmation button for inputting the user's decision to receive the service, a response of an agreement to the reference restriction is sent to the server (column 6, lines 15-25).

3)   At the server side, a password of the user and the reference restriction management information are generated.

4)   Thereafter, the user requests to acquire the reference restricted page by using the password sent from the server.

5)   When the server confirms that the user is proper, the link information of the reference restricted page is sent to the user.

According to the inventor, an object of Araki is to replace former URL information with other URL information, when confirming URL information at the server side sent from the client (i.e., a toll charge system and such are confirmed, and then permission of an agreement for access is obtained). See, Araki, Abstract and column 6, lines 15-60. Further, in the operation of the information of Araki, the user of the client side cannot optionally change contents for access, because the operation of the information is performed by the intention (under control) of the controller in charge of the server that restricts access by the client. For instance, if client intends to optionally change a set of information within a scope of charging, the restriction within the scope of charging is given to the client from the server side.

Independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 are amended for clarity. In contrast to Araki, in the claimed present invention, a client can change a set of accessible information in accordance with the client's condition. That is to say, in the claimed present invention, the subject for restricting is different from Araki's subject for restricting, as follows: In contrast to Araki, in the claimed present invention, a user can receive previously registered, at a server, information (e.g., a URL list) that correspond to an access site of the user (page 4, lines 15-19; page 10, line 22 to page 14, line 22; and FIGS. 1 and 2 of the present Application) (i.e., "*acquiring a piece of the information corresponding to the access site information*; and a transmitting module transmitting the information acquired to said client*, wherein the information is registered into the server in advance according to a user of said client*" (e.g., independent claim 1)). For example, a benefit of the claimed present invention, in case of previously user registered, at a server, URL lists that correspond to an access site of the user, is that futile URLs (unnecessary URLs) can be omitted, such as URLs that are within a firewall and cannot be accessed from a particular access site of the user and/or personal or private URLs of the user that should be omitted when the user is referencing the URL list from a business access site.

Accordingly, in contrast to Araki, the claimed present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 13, using claim 1 as an example, provides:

> 1.　　(Currently Amended) A server for providing information to a client via a network, comprising:
>
> a receiving module receiving, from said client, a request for providing the information from said client, **the providing request containing a piece of access site information on an access site through which said client accesses said network**;
>
> an acquisition module **acquiring a piece of the information corresponding to the access site information**; and
>
> a transmitting module transmitting the information acquired to said client, **wherein the information is registered into the server in advance according to a user of said client**.

Araki (as well as Ames and Smith, which are generally relied upon to reject dependent claim features) fail to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's server having "a receiving module receiving, from said client, a request for providing the information from said client, **the providing request containing a piece of access site information on an access site through which said client accesses said network**; ... **acquiring a piece of information corresponding to the access site information**; and a transmitting module transmitting the information acquired to said client, **wherein the information is registered into the server in advance according to a user of said client**" (e.g., independent claim 1).

In particular, in contrast to Araki, Ames and Smith, the claimed present invention as recited in amended independent claim 8 provides:

> 8.　　(CURRENTLY AMENDED) A method for a server to provide information to a client via a network, comprising:
>
> **registering, in advance, in the server, according to a user of the client, the information**;
>
> receiving **a request, from said client, for providing the in advance registered** information from said client, the providing **request containing a piece of access site information** on an access site through which said client accesses said network;
>
> acquiring **a piece of the in advance registered information corresponding to the access site information**; and
>
> **transmitting the information acquired to said client**.

Support for the claim amendment can be found, for example, on page 4, lines 15-19; page 10, line 22 to page 14, line 22; and FIGS. 1-3 of the present Application.

Therefore, as discussed above, the claimed present invention is not anticipated by Araki and is patentably distinguishing over Araki, Ames and Smith, because the relied upon references fail to disclose or suggest every feature recited in the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 13, and in view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Dependent claims are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. For example, the Office Action rejects dependent claim 6 by relying on Ames, column 1, lines 56-65, which discusses, "The request includes the L3 address of server 104, and specifies the L2 address of client 106 as the "source address" of the request." However, this Ames discussion relates to typically intra-vlan communication, which fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's, "6. (Original) A server according to claim 1, wherein *the access site information is a source address of the providing request*" and the "source address of the providing request" is used by the server in "*acquiring a piece of the information corresponding to the access site information*; and a transmitting module transmitting the information acquired to said client*, wherein the information is registered into the server in advance according to a user of said client*" (e.g., independent claim 1). In other words, combining typical intra-vlan communication, as discussed in Ames, with Araki, fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's patentably distinguishing feature of a server having "a receiving module receiving*, from said client,* a request for providing the information from said client, *the providing request containing a piece of access site information on an access site through which said client accesses said network*; ... *acquiring a piece of information corresponding to the access site information*; and a transmitting module transmitting the information acquired to said client*, wherein the information is registered into the server in advance according to a user of said client*" (e.g., independent claim 1) and "wherein *the access site information is a source address of the providing request*" (e.g., dependent claim 6). Accordingly, dependent claim 6 is allowable over Araki, Ames and Smith.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 25, 2005   By: _____

Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

10